

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,849	11/30/2000	Jong Jin Park	2658-0252P	8778
2292	7590 03/25/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			AWAD, AMR A	
	, JRCH, VA 22040-074	7	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2675	9
			DATE MAILED: 03/25/200	ί 4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/725,849	PARK ET AL.	····
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amr Awad	2675	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati	on appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED 16 March 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is requir final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be ei condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	ed to avoid abandonment of this a ther: (1) a timely filed amendmen Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	application. A proper rep t which places the applica	ly to a ation in
PERIOD I	FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	e of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date s y expire later than SIX MONTHS from the PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	e mailing date of the final reject S OF THE FINAL REJECTION	tion. . See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received but timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	e period of extension and the correspond n date of the shortened statutory period for y the Office later than three months after	ing amount of the fee. The apport reply originally set in the fina	propriate extension I Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be en	tered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would requi	re further consideration and/or se	arch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see	e Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the appli issues for appeal; and/or	cation in better form for appeal by	y materially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without	canceling a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected clain	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	_ would be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed	l amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) req application in condition for allowance beca		n considered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be conside raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		LELY to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ame explanation of how the new or amended cl			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as f	ollows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 9 and 10.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8, 11-14,16,18,20-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b) disapproved	ed by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure S	tatement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
10. Other:		hour Honed the 3-23-2004	dina)
		MAN AMMEN THE	
		3-23-2004	£

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Applicant argued that Takahashi discloses applying a first selecting voltage in a predetermined period of the first horizontal period in one frame and applying a second selecting voltage in the second half of the first horizontal period in next frame, which is different from the claimed limitation of applying a second signal during an ending of the same frame. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is clear from figures 8A-8D that the reference shows the two signal within the same frame.